

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_85140
Title of the Manuscript:	ISOLATION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF PHYLLOSPHERE MICROFLORA OF MAIZE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract The author wrote an introduction to his idea that is not abstract; this section should contain results but only the background and the tests he did were written, hence the most important results obtained should be mentioned.</p> <p>Introduction The author cited two manuscripts only published in 1961 and 2003 ?????? how this? The introduction section should contain recent citations besides the aim of his manuscript.</p> <p>Materials and methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ No references were mentioned in this section except for biochemical tests (one reference was cited for all tests), are the methods he used novel?▪ besides he wrote this section 99% identical to the following paper.▪ DOI: https://doi.org/10.22271/chemi.2020.v8.i6p.10909▪ The author mentioned that he used PDA and Nutrient agar media, but he didn't write any tests for fungi he isolated. <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ This section was very poor discussed.▪ No results were mentioned for the isolated fungi although you mentioned that 6 isolates were recovered on PDA (No data in tables, no photos, no testes)▪ The photos for biochemical tests are blurry without any data.	Revised Corrected Done
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Conclusion The author can't conclude his results perfectly, rewrite this section</p> <p>References No recent references were cited in this manuscript although many recent manuscripts were published during the period (2019-2022) in this field. The recent reference you cited was been published during 2016, are this logic while we are in 2022 ?</p>	Done
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Generally, the manuscript written in poor language, I suggest that the author should review and editing his manuscript carefully.▪ Although the idea is good, but the working plan is poor.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	